



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

course it would be idle to point out the utter erroneousness of such a system. Attention, however, may be directed to one point: Although he insists on *rhythm* (which he cannot define) as the great essential, it is evident that his system allows no rhythm. His scheme of "terra tremit, fugere ferae, et mortalia corda" is $\text{L U L U U L U L U U U U U U L U}$. Even E. A. Poe's system secured rhythm, i. e., a recurrence of the stress at approximately equal intervals of time. These pamphlets of course contain numerous minor errors. One of the most striking is where he writes (Verg. Aen. VII 812) "illam omnis" *téctis* agrisque effúsa juvéntus," combining *omnis* and *tectis* under one accent, because "omnis, being unemphatic, *leans on its noun*"! The sole merit of these essays is, that they propose to do away with the too prevalent system of sacrificing the sense to the "scansion"; but it seems never to have occurred to the author that sense, quantity, ictus, and accent, can all be observed at the same time.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

A Hand-Book to Modern Greek. By EDGAR VINCENT, Coldstream Guards, and T. G. DICKSON. With a Preface by Prof. BLACKIE. London, Macmillan & Co., 1879. 16mo, xvi 273. (Cushings & Bailey, Baltimore. \$1.25.)

When we say that this is the best work on modern Greek that has hitherto appeared in the English language, we are not giving it very high praise, or naming any test by which its merits can be appreciated. There does not indeed exist, in any language, a really good book on modern Greek, and to this general statement the present work forms no marked exception. The great demerit of them all is, that they do not emphasize or make important in practice, the fact that modern Greek is not a language, but three dialects merging into each other more or less imperceptibly. There is, first, the *χρδαία* or vulgar Romaic, the language of the common people, the language of the Klephtic ballads, and, indeed, the only form of Greek in which poetry, properly so-called, can be written. Next, there is the *καθομιλουμένη* or speech of the middle classes, very fairly represented in the present volume by the extracts from the *Θιχογένεια καὶ Σχημαί* of Angelos Vlachos (*Βλάχος*), pp. 221-31. It is a sort of reformed Romaic, suited to the purposes of cultivated life. Lastly there is the *καθαρεύουσα*, or jumble

of Romaic and ancient Greek forms and French idioms, a non-descript and artificial dialect in which most of the Greeks write, but which hardly anybody, except a few professors at the university, speaks. The present work is, for the most part, a hand-book of this last strange dialect, occasionally, indeed, taking up forms and idioms belonging to the other two, but nowhere carefully distinguishing them. This, of course, leads only to confusion. What can a person think, when he finds, e. g., *he told him*, expressed, sometimes by τὸν εἶπε, sometimes by τοῦ εἶπε, and sometimes by τῷ εἶπε? All three are, indeed, in use in Greece, but under different circumstances. The Grammar (Part I), which occupies 120 pages, is concise and not very incorrect. It is strange, however, to be told that Turkish nouns have no dative, without being told at the same time the reason, viz., that they are not used in the *καθαρεύουσα*, which alone has a dative. It is also surprising to a person who speaks Greek to find the acc. plur. of *καφέξ* given as *καφέδας* (p. 32), a form which nobody uses. Indeed, the authors must have found, on trial, that *they* could not use it; for on page 34, last example, we read ὁ οἰκοδόμος πύργος ἐξήγησε δύο καφέδες, which is correct. The Grammar is full of such little inaccuracies, with here and there some glaringly large ones, as, e. g., where we are told, p. 113, that "The adjective stands before the substantive, with which it agrees, except when the two together form the Predicate" (cf. νόπας ὁλοκλήρους, p. 240), or that "The Second Singular Imperative [of the Second Aor.] is accented on the last syllable," which is true in only five cases at most. Nobody says *φυγέ, μαθέ*, etc. When we are informed that "Modern Greek has retained both the First and Second Aorist (*sic*), but in no one verb are both forms in use," we can easily disprove the latter statement from the work itself, e. g., on p. 97, the Aor. of *τρέχω* is given as *ἔθρεξα*, and yet, on p. 83, we find *ἔξεδραμον*.

Part II, which consists of dialogues and letters, must prove very useful to the student, although the language is such as one rarely hears spoken. Part III, consisting of Passages from Ancient Greek Authors, with translations into Modern Greek, might have been omitted with advantage, and Part IV, containing Selections from Contemporary Greek Writers, made to cover its space. The Vocabulary (Part V) is rendered difficult to use from being arranged under subjects, instead of alphabetically.

In spite, however, of all these drawbacks, and very numerous misprints, this little work cannot fail to be of great use to persons

about to visit Greece, or to take up the study of modern Greek. We ought to add that the authors, though evidently not profound scholars, are as evidently capable of writing a much better book than they have written. Let us hope they will do so, and soon.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

De Alcestidis et Hippolyti Euripidearum Interpolationibus. Disputationis de Interpolatione Euripidea Specimen, etc. J. H. WHEELER (Diss.). Bonnae, 1879.

In this dissertation Dr. Wheeler has evinced a knowledge of his author such as few possess who for the first time undertake the fascinating but perilous exploration of the text of Euripides. It is indeed a dangerous quest; for while all are agreed that the ordinary resources of diplomatic criticism will not suffice to restore the image of the poet's art, still so much depends on the critic's conception of Euripides that many will be found to say, as Dr. Wheeler himself confesses, that the objections lie not against the interpolations but against the poet. The investigator has to encounter at every turn the inevitable circle of arguing from the poet to his work and from the work to the poet. If we reject inconsistencies, repetitions, long-winded declamations, blurs and blotches, because they are not Euripidean, we are in danger of setting up an Euripides of our own, who by means of gradual elimination will cease to bear a recognizable resemblance to the portrait by Aristophanes, which, with all its exaggerations and distortions, is an unmistakable likeness to the original, and this restored Euripides will make it harder for us to accept minor inconsistencies, briefer repetitions, minuter specks, until we arrive at the condition which Hermann so pointedly states in his preface to the *Phoenissae*: *Qui laudis illius adipiscendae gratia de industria suspiciones venatur, in eo ista obelis ostentandae perspicaciae cupiditas postremo in morbum vertit, ipsi quidem qui eo morbo tenetur gratum, aliis autem molestissimum et paene intolerabilem.* But this warning is clearly a note of the old school. Euripidean criticism has, during the last two decades, gone far beyond the old limit, and in the search for truth men cannot be stopped by suspicion of their suspicions. Certainly, in Dr. Wheeler's case, the masculine honesty of his purpose adds a special charm to his learning and insight. It is not surprising that, in his familiarity with Euripides, he should at times rest his *athetesis* on grounds which might